

Oct. 10, 1970:

Mr. B. Z. Mastler,
Mt. Fuel Supply Co.
180 E. 1st So.
Salt Lake City, Ut.

Dear Bud,

Thanks very much for your time to comment on our railroad venture, as I expected, your thoughts were provoking and well done. Although my profit-motive oriented senses wanted to argue with you at several points, I cannot help but agree that overall you are probably right, and I doubt that my additional study on your part will serve to change your original contention. In a sense I had already come to that conclusion, although my own personal involvement due to our property acquisition seems to look bad to the public if I spend too much time promoting this on a public basis, and I'm afraid if I try and back out now, it will fail. Not that I'm that important, but because I've been closer to this than anyone else, and know more about it now than anyone. I am in a real quandry personally.

Dr. Green has always had the public spirit and wholeheartedly agreed with you, but Leon Ritchie, our Chamber president did not emphatically. He is a man whose success has been due to damn hard work, lots of luck, and damn little long term planning. I don't know how he has done it, but there is plenty of visible proof of this success, and I can't know that. He thinks we can "peer-boyc" this deal with about \$10,000.00 and a lot of work, and that any visible indications of our potential of success would force the State to work with us to avoid public condemnation. I couldn't live with this as life is too short to worry that much and I am not willing to start worrying again about meeting the overdrafts and potential failure at every corner. Life is too short to start again. I've gone that route.

There's too much water to boat on, whiskey to drink, women to love and guys to palaround with to take on something like that.

But, I personally and our community is committed to make this thing go, and damn it, it's going to somehow.

Let me give you a couple of thoughts to add to those that we sent in the papers we left with you.:

1. Wasatch County is a member of the Four Corners Economic Development area, which should put us in a position of grants to finance feasibility studies, and possibly be a source of inexpensive money to finance right of way acquisition and possible operating capital during the first few years of operation deficits.

2. The figure of \$200,000 as quoted to us by the Highway department apparently is the figure they want for the use of the railroad right of way from Wildwood to Heber. They justify this figure because of the need for some 90 lb. rail to change the Garfield Western on the west side of Salt Lake for Freeway location. If private enterprise were to acquire this rightaway and track and decide to operate this steam railway on a profit basis, I see no argument with the \$200,000, as it is a fair, (in fact damn good) price for the land and track. But, if we were to try and put this together on a public basis (ie Wasatch County State Park Combine with possibly our Foundation operating it as a concession and on a non profit basis (but damn high officer salaries) then this \$200,000 figure could be argued on the following justifications:

A. There are federal funds involved in the acquisition and building of any U.S. highways, and that percent of federal funds used to acquire this right of way should not be involved to penalize any public agency that is trying to build up the economic attraction of the state of Utah.

B. The stated need for the rails for the change of the Garfield is probably being used as an enticement to get them to agree to moving at not too much cost to the government. They apparently only need 5 miles of rail at the most to relocate, and there is 10 miles of 90# involved in Provo-Heber Valley area. Rumor has it that the balance will be given to Garfield Western to allow them to build up their trackage in the industrial area of Salt Lake, and they are most happy with the deal. This type of compensation to a private concern for freeway use agains involves federal funds, which I understand is as much as 90% of the total cost. Again, there is justification in a position that we have a right to renegotiate the amount to be paid to the hiway department if another public body is responsible for repayment and that payment should not include additional funds to allow Garfield Western to build up their industrial trackage.

C. The difference between Federal participation in building of Provo Canyon (I think its around 65-75%) compared to the 95% Federal on Freeways could also be considered when we attempt to fairly compensate the State Hiway department for Utah Funds dedicated to highway development.

I may have rambled too much, Bud, forgive the langhy paragraphs, but I do appreciate your interest and hope you can help guide us to a successfull conclusion to this endeavor.

Sincerely,

Lowe